

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached Replacement Drawing Sheets replace Figs. 1-15B, 16 A, 16 B and Figs. 17-30 with Figs. 1-15 B, 16 A and B, and Figs. 17-30, respectively.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

The attached New Drawing Sheets add Figs. 15 C; 16 C; and 16 D.

Attachment: New Drawing Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 2-6 and 8-40 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2-4, 9, 16, 17, 19, 27, 29, 31, 34-36, 39 and 40 are amended to clarify the features recited. A substitute specification is attached. Replacement drawing sheets and new drawing sheets are also attached. Specifically, the replacement specification and drawing sheets incorporate the amendments to the specification and drawings that have previously been filed and not entered throughout prosecution. Applicants include a complete set of replacement drawing sheets to replace all prior versions of drawings filed, to avoid any confusion regarding the currently-pending drawings based on the numerous objections to the drawings and drawings filed throughout prosecution. The specification is further amended for clarity and to overcome the objections contained in the Office Action. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' undersigned representative by Examiner Hand during the telephone conference held December 16, are appreciated. During the telephone conference, it was agreed that the above amendments of the claims, specification and replacement drawings and added drawings likely overcome the objections and rejections contained in the Office Action.

The specification and drawings are amended to overcome the objections and rejections contained in the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections is respectfully requested.

On page 5, line 10, the Office Action objects to claim 40 based on the claim language allegedly not being supported in the Applicants' specification. The Office Action's analysis fails for at least the following reasons.

The features recited in claim 40 are supported throughout Applicants' specification and throughout Applicants' figures. The Office Action appears to rely on page 22, which

discloses that the described embodiments are not limited to the positional relationships described below. That is, Applicants' specification merely indicates that the described embodiments are examples and the features of the disclosure may take on other embodiments. This portion of Applicants' specification does not exclude the features recited in claim 40. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the Amendment filed January 2, 2009 as allegedly adding new matter based on the amendments to pages 12, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35 and 39. Applicants respectfully submit these proposed amendments are not incorporated into the attached substitute specification. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to pages 12, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35 and 39 merely deleted paragraphs and figures. Thus, these amendments added no new matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested

On page 7, the Office Action objects to claims 2-6 and 8-40 based on informalities. On line 12 of page 7, the Office Action indicates that lines 14-15 of claim 40 could be rewritten and proposes claim language. While Applicants appreciate the Office Action's suggested claim language, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 40, as written, is proper. That is, lines 14-15 of claim 40 do not require correction because one having ordinary skill in the art would understand the subject matter claimed, based on lines 14-15 of claim 40 as written. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.


On page 10, the Office Action rejects claims 2-6 and 8-40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the features recited in claim 40 are supported in Applicants' specification as originally filed at least at pages 43-46, and in original Figs. 15A and 15B. Further support for the features of claim 40 can be found throughout Applicants'

specification. The Office Action appears to allege that Applicants must use the same language in claims as are used to describe the embodiments in the disclosure of Applicants' specification. The subject matter of the claims need not be described literally (*i.e.*, using the same terms or *in haec verba*) in order for the disclosure to satisfy the written description requirement. See MPEP §2163. That is, one having ordinary skill in the art would reasonably conclude from Applicants' specification that Applicants had possession of the claimed subject matter as of their filing date. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2-6 and 8-40 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:DAT/jqw

Date: January 7, 2011

Attachments:

- Marked Up Copy of Orginal Specification
- Clean Substitute Specification
- Replacement Drawing Sheets Figs. 1-30
- New Drawing Sheets Figs. 15C and 16 C and D
- Amended Abstract
- Petition for Extension of Time

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461